Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/091,439	KUNITA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cynthia Hamilton	1752
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Cynthia Hamilton</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Robert Mukai.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 June 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: NONE		
Claims discussed: NONE		
Prior art documents discussed: NONE		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.	•	
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
Cynthia Lamba		
(Exampler/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		
J.S. Polint and Trademark Office PRIMARY EXAMINER		

6-16-04

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Mukai was informed that the amendment to the specification submitted March 8, 2004 was not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 wherein on page 13 applicants had set forth amendment by line instead of full paragraph. The examiner agreed to amend the specification as desired by applicants in view of all issues with respect to allowance of the application having been resolved by applicants concurrent amendment to the claims. Since only the amendment section to the specification could not be entered as submitted the examiner agreed to amend by examiner's amendment each line to be changed. It was noted by the examiner that certain underlined portions of the specification amendment were not part of the material to be amended but were original underlined words in the original specification papers. These were to be left un touched by the examiner's amendment.

June 16, 2004